

process are the costs of regulations. In fact, the vast majority of economic costs induced by federal actions remain off the books.

We propose reforming the legislative and regulatory processes to put these costs on the books. After all, proper budgeting is about making trade-offs between competing wants and limited resources, and it requires planning, setting priorities and making difficult decisions. But these decisions cannot be made without a more complete understanding of the direct and indirect costs of proposed legislation and spending bills, and their regulatory progeny. Our proposal, called legislative impact accounting, would provide that information to Congress.

Estimates of the total cost of regulations vary widely, but by any account, they represent a significant cost to the economy. Government economists in the Office of Management and Budget tally up the direct compliance costs associated with rules created in the last decade that have an effect of more than \$100 million annually. OMB's most recent estimate was that annual costs fall between \$57 and \$84 billion. Conversely, economists John Dawson and John Seater estimated how the economy would look if federal regulations were held to 1949 levels—essentially asking the question: What if, instead of spending resources on regulatory compliance, businesses invested in research and development? The answer was shocking. In 2011, instead of \$15.1 trillion, annual GDP would have equaled \$54 trillion . . .

Our proposal, legislative impact accounting, would incorporate economic analyses of legislation and regulation into the budget process in two ways: First, when new legislation is proposed, an independent office—perhaps the Congressional Budget Office—would produce an estimate of the economic costs the legislation would create. Importantly, a legislative impact assessment would attempt to consider economic costs of proposed legislation, not just budgetary outlays. Examples of some of the effects that could be included as specific line items are: direct compliance costs, employment effects, technological hindrances, trade distortions, and changes to the cumulative regulatory burden. This type of analysis is not unprecedented. The European Commission provides impact assessments on all legislation considered by the European Parliament.

Second, legislative impact accounting would require retrospective analyses of the economic effects of legislation, starting five years after the legislation passed. The idea is to learn what the real effects have been, and to then update the original estimates produced in the first stage. This would effectively create a much-needed feedback loop that communicates information about the economic effects of legislation back to Congress.

Mr. ENZI. I yield the floor.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Morning business is closed.

NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2016

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will resume consideration of H.R. 1735, which the clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 1735) to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for mili-

tary construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes.

Pending:

McCain amendment No. 1463, in the nature of a substitute.

McCain amendment No. 1456 (to amendment No. 1463), to require additional information supporting long-range plans for construction of naval vessels.

Cornyn amendment No. 1486 (to amendment No. 1463), to require reporting on energy security issues involving Europe and the Russian Federation, and to express the sense of Congress regarding ways the United States could help vulnerable allies and partners with energy security.

Vitter amendment No. 1473 (to amendment No. 1463), to limit the retirement of Army combat units.

Markey amendment No. 1645 (to amendment No. 1463), to express the sense of Congress that exports of crude oil to United States allies and partners should not be determined to be consistent with the national interest if those exports would increase energy prices in the United States for American consumers or businesses or increase the reliance of the United States on imported oil.

Reed (for Blumenthal) amendment No. 1564 (to amendment No. 1463), to increase civil penalties for violations of the Servicemembers Civil Relief Act.

McCain (for Paul) modified amendment No. 1543 (to amendment No. 1463), to strengthen employee cost savings suggestions programs within the Federal Government.

Reed (for Durbin) modified amendment No. 1559 (to amendment No. 1463), to prohibit the award of Department of Defense contracts to inverted domestic corporations.

McCain (for Burr) modified amendment No. 1569 (to amendment No. 1463), to improve cybersecurity in the United States through enhanced sharing of information about cybersecurity threats.

Feinstein (for McCain) amendment No. 1889 (to amendment No. 1463), to reaffirm the prohibition on torture.

Fischer/Booker amendment No. 1825 (to amendment No. 1463), to authorize appropriations for national security aspects of the Merchant Marine for fiscal years 2016 and 2017.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arizona.

Mr. MCCAIN. Madam President, as we return to the legislation, unfortunately we are still, apparently, unable to move forward with managers' packages and amendments and others. So I would like to apologize to my colleagues on both sides of the aisle who have pending amendments, who have parts of managers' packages, and who have invested so many hours of time and effort to this legislation, not to mention members of the committee who spent an inordinate amount of time putting together a Defense authorization bill that I think all of us on both sides, with the exception of four who voted against it, were proud of and a product that was accomplished in a bipartisan fashion.

I, again, want to thank my friend from Rhode Island for all of his hard work. But apparently right now we are still stuck in resistance. Rather than go through all of the reasons why, I hope we can have some serious negotia-

tions in order for us to move forward and complete this legislation.

Meanwhile, the world moves on, and there are greater and greater challenges to our security. In fact, this morning the New York Times says: "Trainers Intended as Lift, but Quick Iraq Turnaround Is Unlikely." That is The New York Times.

The New York Times says:

Mr. Obama's plan does not call for small teams of American troops to accompany Iraqi fighters onto the battlefield, to call in airstrikes or advise on combat operations. Nor is it likely to significantly intensify an air campaign in which American warplanes have been able to locate and bomb their targets only about a quarter of the time.

"This alone is not going to do it," said Michele A. Flournoy, who was the senior policy official in the Pentagon during Mr. Obama's first term. "It is a great first step, but it should be the first in a series of steps."

One of the reasons I have that quote from Michele Flournoy is that it is not just former Bush administration officials. It is former Obama administration officials who all agree that what we are doing is without strategy and without prospect of success.

POLITICO article: "Obama's Iraq quagmire."

The President finds himself dragged back into a war he was elected to end.

When pressed on why the latest efforts do not include having American troops serve as spotters for airstrikes or sending Apache aircraft to back up the Iraqi troops, Deputy National Security Adviser Ben Rhodes told reporters the president "has been very clear he'll look at a range of different options."

That is encouraging that the President has been very clear. I love it. All these spokespeople use two sorts of fillers: One is "very clear" and the other is "quite frankly."

Do you ever notice that? Isn't that interesting? Maybe we should take that out of their vocabulary—"very clear" and "frankly"—when they are neither clear nor frank.

But anyway, Mr. Rhodes said—he is really a very interesting guy: "The U.S. military cannot and should not do this simply for Iraqis, and, frankly, Iraqis want to be in the lead themselves."

"The U.S. military cannot and should not do this simply for Iraqis."

Does anyone in the world think that the United States of America would be engaged simply for Iraqis? Has Mr. Rhodes ever listened to Mr. Baghdadi and ISIS and their intentions to attack and destroy America as much as they possibly can?

POLITICO: "Trainers or advisors? White House and Pentagon don't agree."

The White House says the new batch of troops deploying to Iraq are going to train Iraqi recruits to fight the Islamic State. The Pentagon says the 450 American personnel headed to Al-Taqqaddum Air Base are going over just as advisers.

The mixed signals come as President Barack Obama struggles to find a balance between achieving his goal of "degrading and ultimately destroying" the terrorist group known as the Islamic State in Iraq and the Levant while avoiding restarting a war in